

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Hepatology

Manuscript NO: 31219

Title: Impact of comorbidity on waiting list and post-transplant outcomes in patients undergoing liver retransplantation

Reviewer's code: 03253495

Reviewer's country: Italy

Science editor: Fang-Fang Ji

Date sent for review: 2016-11-18

Date reviewed: 2016-11-19

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	SCIENTIFIC MISCONDUCT	CONCLUSION
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing	Google Search:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Accept
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> The same title	<input type="checkbox"/> High priority for publication
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication	<input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejected	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	<input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Poor		BPG Search:	<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision
		<input type="checkbox"/> The same title	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	
		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

Very well written paper. I do not have issues to raise.

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Hepatology

Manuscript NO: 31219

Title: Impact of comorbidity on waiting list and post-transplant outcomes in patients undergoing liver retransplantation

Reviewer's code: 03646816

Reviewer's country: United States

Science editor: Fang-Fang Ji

Date sent for review: 2016-11-18

Date reviewed: 2016-11-23

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	SCIENTIFIC MISCONDUCT	CONCLUSION
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing	Google Search:	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> The same title	<input type="checkbox"/> High priority for publication
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication	<input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejected	<input type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	<input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Poor		<input type="checkbox"/> No	<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision
		BPG Search:	
		<input type="checkbox"/> The same title	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	
		<input type="checkbox"/> No	

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

Overall good manuscript, to which a few important changes should be made: 0. Please justify the use of patients assessed for LRT, as opposed to listed or actually transplanted, given that your LRT cohort consists of patients transplanted. 1. Page 8: definition of DM is repeated. 2. Page 9: CTP is not written in full before abbreviations. 3. In general, there are too many abbreviations over the entire manuscript. About half of these need to be removed to allow for easier and more fluid reading. 4. Table 3: Are these LRT patients only? Please specify in title. 5. Page 12: Can authors comment on mortality per wait list years or a similar term? This might clarify the relationship between PLT/LRT waiting list mortality. 6. Page 12: Is presence of ascites really included in the multivariate model? There is no multivariate analysis for ascites in Table 2. 7. Page 13: Please include the % 5-year survival for recipients of 1 and 2 grafts as well. 8. Page 13: With regards to the timing of LRT, it would be interesting to perform a subgroup analysis on the early LRT patients to assess both cause of re-transplant and comorbidities/MELD scores here.

9. Are long-term and 1-year survival used interchangeably throughout the manuscript? This must be clarified. If not, long-term survival must be defined. 10. When discussing "post-transplant patient and graft survival" throughout the manuscript, please specify clearly if these are LRT patients. 11. Page 13: "MELD/UKELD scores are not associated with long term patient survival". What about MELD >18? 12. How were the fixed variables in the multivariate models chosen? 13. Discussion: Authors should comment further on the young age of LRT vs. PLT patients. 14. Discussion: Again, please specify what long term post-LRT survival is defined as. 15. Page 16, second paragraph: New data is being presented here that belongs in the results section. 16. Page 17, first paragraph: Please comment on MELD scores as well as UKELD in WL mortality, especially since MELD cutoff at 18 is mentioned in the conclusion paragraph. 17. Inotrope use: this data is not presented in the results, nor is it in table 3.

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Hepatology

Manuscript NO: 31219

Title: Impact of comorbidity on waiting list and post-transplant outcomes in patients undergoing liver retransplantation

Reviewer's code: 03700164

Reviewer's country: Singapore

Science editor: Fang-Fang Ji

Date sent for review: 2016-11-18

Date reviewed: 2016-11-24

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	SCIENTIFIC MISCONDUCT	CONCLUSION
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing	Google Search:	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> The same title	<input type="checkbox"/> High priority for publication
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication	<input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejected	<input type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	<input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Poor		[Y] No	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Major revision
		BPG Search:	
		<input type="checkbox"/> The same title	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	
		[Y] No	

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

1. The discussion section needs to be more concise 2. The abstract can clearly specify the potential unfavourable impact of high CCI scores on survival- instead of "CCI was associated with WL and post-LRT survival". 3. In the co-morbidities section- The criteria for diagnosing DM has been mentioned twice in the description. This needs to be corrected. To make this section more readable and easy to comprehend, the authors could perhaps display the criteria in tabular form with a reference in the text alluding to this table. 4. Early LRT patients need to be discussed in more detail and ideally this would benefit from a sub-group/separate analysis. This is because, the co-morbidity issues might have a potentially less severe implication as chronicity is a factor. This is also helpful in eliminating potential bias 5. There are minor spelling/grammar issues, which would also need to be addressed.